

#### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The allowance of Claims 12-22 and the indicated allowability of the subject matter of Claims 3, 5, 6, and 8-10 are noted with appreciation.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish patentably from the Schwartzman reference relied upon in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claim 1 now recites that a dimension of each fin longitudinally of an inner surface of the sleeve is a plurality of times greater than the thickness of the fin. This feature of the invention which is apparent from the non-limiting example on page 10 of the specification, beginning at line 7, is not taught by Schwartzman. Accordingly, Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon should be allowed.

The rejection of Claim 2, now made independent, is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 recites, inter alia, that at least one longitudinal end of the fins extends away from the respective longitudinal end of the sleeve and away from the inner surface of the sleeve. See, e.g., Figs. 4, 6, 8, and 11 of Applicant's drawings. This construction is not

taught by Schwartzman. Accordingly, Claim 2 should be allowed.

New Claims 23-26 are independent claims incorporating the allowable subject matter of Claims 3, 5, 6, and 8, respectively. New dependent Claims 27 and 28 correspond to allowed Claims 9 and 10.

New Claims 29-61 have been added to provide more comprehensive protection for the invention.

New Claim 29 recites, inter alia, that the tips of the fins are free from one another, contrary to the teaching of Schwartzman. Accordingly, this claim and the claims dependent thereon should be allowed.

New Claim 40 recites, inter alia, that a dimension of each fin longitudinally of the inner surface of the sleeve is substantially greater than a dimension of each fin along a direction of its inward projection, contrary to the teaching of Schwartzman. Accordingly, this claim and the claims dependent thereon should be allowed.

New Claim 51 recites the feature added to Claim 1, as well as the features specified above with regard to Claims 29 and 40, all of which is contrary to the teaching of Schwartzman. Accordingly, this claim and the claims dependent thereon should be allowed.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NHS:lmb

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 903-9000

By: Nelson H. Shapiro  
Nelson H. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 17,095

June 4, 2004